

The Republican.

No. 11, Vol. 12.] LONDON, Friday, Sept. 16, 1825. [PRICE 6d.

TO MR. RICHARD CARLILE DORCHESTER GAOL.

SIR,

Bradford, Sept. 5th, 1825.

THOUGH my reply to Mr. Heinekin's remarks on my answer to his lecture will not appear as soon as I wished, yet the fulfilment of my promise is as speedy as my avocations and opportunity would conveniently admit. I shall waste no words in introductory remarks, but proceed at once to my observations on such paragraphs as appear to me to relate to the subject in dispute, viz. "The evidence of a divine superintendence exhibited in the works of Nature and the affairs of the world."

Notwithstanding the explanation given by Mr. H. in the 5th paragraph of his remarks, I am still unable to fix any other meaning to the phrase, "Infidel in practice," than that, "vice is the proper practice of the infidel." What meaning can be attached to the phrase unless it is inferred that the theory of the infidel world, if reduced to practice, produce vice?—what is the practice of the mechanic but the application of his theory to create machinery or its produce? We do not call navigation the application of the theory of chemistry, nor land surveying the result of the theory of hydraulics. We naturally suppose, that drunkenness is the practice of the drunkard, and adultery and fornication of the sensual debauchee—Indeed, the explanation given by Mr. H. in this paragraph, instead of removing, the imputation, gives additional force to the inference previously drawn; for, though he says, he "would be far from asserting that there is a necessary connection between Infidelity and Vice," yet he has "no hesitation in maintaining that infidelity is *highly favourable* to the growth of vice, and can hardly fail of producing it, if the mind has not been well cultivated by education, and the passions are not restrained by the suggestions of prudence." No proof

Printed and Published by R. Carlile, 135, Fleet Street.

of this proposition is offered ; and I should be justified by a merely opposite assertion, but I will attempt a brief settlement of the question, whether religion, (meaning thereby a belief in the existence of an omnipotent being and a state of future rewards and punishment at his disposal,) or, infidelity, (by which term we understand, a disbelief of such an existence and state,) be the most favourable to the growth of vice, by which word I mean that mode of conduct, which tends to produce the greatest misery to the individual, and consequently to society. Virtue, of course, will signify that which produces the greatest happiness. It will not, I presume, be denied, that every one invariably seeks his own happiness, it being his interest to do so, and whenever he fails in the attainment, he does so, from his ignorance of the means requisite for the purpose ; and it consequently follows, that knowledge is the grand desideratum of mankind. He is the wisest man, who chooses the best ends, and the best means to secure those ends. In short "knowledge is power." So far then the believer and unbeliever are upon a level ; but here the difference between them commences.—The unbeliever having no hopes or fears from any rewards or punishments after death, will model his actions so as to generate as much pleasurable sensation as possible ; will be virtuous in proportion to his knowledge, as virtue is that which will make him happy, and vice that which will render him miserable. He will never be vicious, but when he is mistaken in the means conducive to happiness. What will be the conduct of the believer ? We will first take the believer in the existence of a deity and a future state of rewards and punishments, unassisted by revelation, and afterwards consider the Christian believer.—From the appearances in nature the Theist cannot infer what actions will be pleasing or displeasing to the deity.—Pain and want are frequently the lot of men whose actions are, by us, regarded as beneficial to mankind, and wealth and pleasure are often bestowed upon men whose actions are injurious to multitudes, and whose passions involve whole nations in calamity. Excruciating agony afflicts the infant, which cannot have deserved the slightest misery, and the monster who lives on the spoil of the indigent, and jests at their woes, rolls in splendour and power.—From such appearances as these the Theist is placed in the greatest uncertainty, as to what actions will be regarded with approbation or displeasure by the omnipotent dispenser of future rewards and punishments.

The very doubt which hangs upon his mind as to the beneficence of his deity, he is compelled to recoil from with terror, and he regards the slightest imputation upon his goodness as a crime of extraordinary magnitude.—He lauds the benevolence of the deity to the skies; while he trembles with the deepest apprehension, when he approaches the boundary between the present and future. Were the unknown future always to operate upon his imagination in full force, it would be impossible for the Theist to retain his senses. All is dark, dreary, and unfathomable, replete with terror and apprehended torment. From what can the Theist infer that he shall be happy in the next world? From the mercy of the deity? Where are his grounds of reliance? Experience here is no clue to the dispensations of an incomprehensible almighty being, and the expectations we derive from the contemplation of one, whose actions are governed by principles inconceivable to us, and who possesses ubiquity and absolute and unlimited power, are fear and agonizing anxiety. — In order to serve this being most effectually the Theist will be able to invent no mode but unbounded devotion, utter prostration and humiliation of himself at his shrine; and as proofs of his firm attachment, he will be led to practise self-denial and bodily austerities, because these will be supposed to be the most disinterested marks of his regard, but the adoption of pleasurable actions though useful, would be open to the suspicion of being performed for the sake of the pleasure. He would also feel it his duty to regard with abhorrence the unbeliever as an object of the deity's displeasure, and persecution (if he had power) would be the next result of the Theist's religion. The motives of the Theist to actions detrimental to the happiness of himself as well to that of mankind in general, and consequently favourable to vice, might be proved to be almost infinite, from the numerous sources of mischief which are the consequences of Natural Religion or Theism, but to those, who are desirous of seeing the subject handled in a clear and satisfactory manner, I recommend the "Analysis of the Influence of Natural Religion on the Temporal Happiness of Mankind" by Philip Beauchamp. It is a work, which comprises in 140 pages the most exquisite logical argument, and ought to be in the possession of every person who aspires to the reputation of a correct reasoner on theological subjects. I should be extremely happy to see an analysis of the influence of *revealed religion* on man's temporal happiness executed by the same masterly

hand. To return to the subject. I will now investigate the motives which are likely to affect the Christian and for this purpose it will be necessary to examine some of the prominent precepts and examples contained in the Old and New Testament. Of the decalogue, the first four commandments direct the performance of nothing that is useful to man, nor the abstaining from any thing that is hurtful to him; and the restraining precept, contained in the fourth, is not only useless, but in many cases mischievous, and in some if taken literally, is utterly impossible to be kept. The fifth is too vague and indeterminate for practice, for no man or woman ought to be honoured, whose conduct is vicious, in whatever relation he or she may stand to us. The four next precepts have a beneficial tendency, but they are so notoriously the growth of social relations even in a very rude state of society, that they are absurd as making part of a divine revelation. The tenth forbids the indulgence of a desire of my neighbour's wife or property, and if this precept could have been rendered efficient, the commands "thou shalt not commit adultery," and "thou shalt not steal," would have been nugatory. The whole of the decalogue is a collection of negative directions, and recommends the practice of no one virtue. The four last books of the Pentateuch abound with institutions and precepts; and among the vast number of both, it is remarkable how few are really calculated for the benefit of society. The aim of the legislator seems to have been to heap advantages on a small portion of the Jews, at the expense of the multitude. I shall not stop to particularize the absurdity and injustice of many of the laws laid down by Moses; but I think it must strike the most superficial reader, how much the penalties attached to their violation are almost invariably made to augment the wealth of the priesthood under the names of sin offerings trespass, offerings, &c. The end of an enlightened legislator (and who can surpass the deity in wisdom?) ought to be the greatest happiness and advantage of the greatest number of his people. But every one will readily perceive that the Jewish Lawgiver's attentions are ever turned with criminal partiality to the levitical priesthood. The immense mass of property said to be extracted from the people for the performance of the ceremonies of the worship of Jehovah, is incredible; but allowing the statement to be true, the privations of the bulk of the Jews in furnishing means for these institutions, and the support of one entirely unproductive tribe, must have been

extreme, and easily accounts for the various rebellions and commotions among them. I will pass on to the celebrated sermon on the mount as being supposed to comprise the substance of the morality and precepts taught by Jesus.—Some of the precepts and exhortations are of an excellent nature, but others are impracticable and foolish as well as pernicious.—It would extend this article to a much greater length than will be convenient, to enumerate more than a small part of the latter sort; but the following quotations will serve to bear me out in my assertion, “Resist not evil, but whoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.” “If any man will sue thee at law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.” “And whoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain.” “Give to him that asketh of thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn thou not away.” “Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use and persecute you.” “Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. In one place Jesus is made to say “think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace but a sword; for I am come to set a man at variance against his father; and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law. And a man’s foes shall be they of his own household.” And in another place, he declares, that unless a man hate his father and mother, wife and children and brothers and sisters he cannot be his disciple. If we are told that we are not to understand these sentences literally, by what rule are we to interpret them? It may be also objected to me, that I take no notice of those commands and injunctions that tend to benefit mankind. I answer, that whatever number of these there may be, it does not at all detract from the force of the proposition I am supporting, that religion is favourable to the growth of vice, for so long as useless pernicious and contradictory dogmas contribute so great a share in the general mass, the result of them must be uncertainty and debasement in the mind of the professing, and believing Christian. Besides, we must take into the account of Christianity the necessary and indispensable overwhelming coercion of mind implied in the sentence “he that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned;” thereby making it imperative on the poor hesitating proselyte, whatever appearances may suggest to him, to prostrate his facul-

ties, to the adoption of certain truth. Does he feel the least doubt, perdition is the necessary consequence. He is not allowed to use his reason, for that would probably ensure his damnation, by undermining his faith. Besides all this, the simple believer is not sure that his belief will procure his salvation, for in another part of the gospels he is told that if a man be not born again of water and the spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God, so that without being made a new creature his belief, about which so much is said, and upon which so great a stress is laid, is of no use to him. How can a religion like this tend to produce any good, when the salvation of mankind is made to depend on an incomprehensible creed, and a feeling made up of passion and enthusiasm? We will now turn to the example exhibited by some of the men, who are represented in the scriptures as favourites of the deity of the Jews and Christians. What is there to admire in the conduct of Abraham, who was twice guilty of a deliberate falsehood and behaved in a most cruel manner to Hagar and Ishmael, the one his concubine and the other his oldest son? The great act, which is held up to us for our reverential admiration, is what no sane man would be foolish enough to imitate. He believed that the deity required a sacrifice of a beloved child, and, had he not been restrained, he would actually have cut Isaac's throat; and this was counted to him for righteousness. Can there be a stronger proof of the debasement of man, than that one could be found to attempt, and the votaries of religion to applaud, such an act? on a similar occasion, repeated the falsehood of Isaac his father, and his son Jacob, who was an especial favourite of the deity, was a liar to his father and a swindler to his brother. The task would be endless to mark with reprobation the actions of the select worthies mentioned in the *sacred* volume. What can be more revolting than the deeds of Moses who (instructed by a deity who hardened the heart of Pharaoh, and destroyed all the first born of the Egyptians in a single night for the sins of Pharaoh,) murdered so many thousands of men, women and children of different nations; because they did not worship a god of whom they knew nothing, but by his people's cruelties? Joshua's actions were worthy a pupil of the meek Moses. Samuel is a precious specimen of the priesthood, and David of pious kings. It would be difficult to point out one single praiseworthy deed, of this "man after God's own heart," in the whole course of the history wherein he is mentioned, but many of them deserve the severest censure though none but his con-

duct to Uriah seems to have been marked by the displeasure of Jehovah ; and what is the punishment appropriated to it ? a pestilence among his subjects who were not culpable ! Such is the morality enforced by the examples of holy men ! How can it be possible that virtue should grow out of a belief in a religion where the precepts are of such a mixed nature, good, bad, contradictory, absurd and indecent. What can be more " favourable to the growth of vice," than to represent, as the chosen of the Deity, men whose conduct has been fraught with deceit, rapine, cruelty, debauchery and murder ? Having treated this part of the subject at much greater length than I intended, I shall shortly dismiss it, and shall say nothing of the apparent contradictions and incredible stories contained in the books of the Old and New Testaments, as my business is merely with its tendency to produce virtue or vice. The vices of the unbeliever will only happen in consequence of his ignorance ; for if he were perfectly aware, that misery is the sure attendant of vice ; he would not practice vice therefore, as I before observed, knowledge would be a certain remedy for the evil ; but knowledge would be little of a corrective to the evil propensities of the believer, whose notions of the deity lead him to infer that an assent to certain mysterious dogmas are absolutely requisite to ensure his future happiness and that such assent will alone be sufficient, though he may have been a scourge to society. There is another absurd contradictory and evidently mischievous tenet held by Christians and fortified by an example, namely, that by repentance, a sinner, be he ever so vile, may be saved at the last hour, of which the thief on the cross is an instance, so that the most infamous scoundrel that ever adorned a gibbet, may, without a single solitary good deed, secure an eternity of happiness. Of how many enormities has not this last mentioned doctrine, (which is equivalent to offering a premium for vice) been the parent ? I come to the sixth paragraph.

Mr. H. here produces two latin quotations from Cicero's " treatise concerning the Gods," the meaning of which is as follows : " For there have been philosophers, who have thought in their mind that the Gods had no management of human affairs. Of whom, if that opinion be true, what piety can there be ? what sanctity ? what religion ? Piety towards the gods being removed, I know not if even fidelity, and the society of mankind, and the excellent virtue *justice* would not be altogether taken away," and to Velleius, I do not think that you, Velleius, are like other epicu-

reans; (who are ashamed of the words of Epicurus), to whom he declares that he does not truly understand any good which can be separated from the delicate and obscene pleasures; all of which he indeed, (*without a blush**) expressly discourses of. Though Epicurus, as well as other ancient philosophers, was ignorant of the sciences which are the most important in our times; yet it seems to me, notwithstanding Cicero's censure of his doctrines, which I suspect he has not represented fairly, that Epicurus had as much knowledge as made him an honour to the times in which he lived. By some he is said to have taught that pleasure was the chief good, and by others it is said that he placed the *summum bonum* in the tranquility of the mind. I believe both accounts, and that when fairly understood, they both have the same meaning. His life, which was that of a moralist, was an excellent commentary on the doctrine he taught, and proved him a true philosopher. I am surprized that any man who is a Christian Monotheist and advocates the necessity of a belief in future rewards and punishments should quote Cicero in his favor, who though an unquestionably great orator, knew little (almost nothing) of the science of astronomy, was completely ignorant of geology and chemistry, and consequently of physics in general, and was himself really a sceptic as will be seen by the following passage quoted from his epistles, book 6, when writing to Zorquatus he says, "Sed hec consolatio levis est; illa gravior, qua te uti spero; ego certe utor. Nec enim dum ero, angar ulla re, cum omni vacem culpa; et si non ero, sensu omnino carebo," in English, "but there is another and a far higher consolation, which I hope is your support, as it is certainly mine. For so long as I shall preserve my innocence, I will never, whilst I exist, be anxiously disturbed at any event that may happen; and if I shall cease to exist, all sensibility must cease with me." What could Epicurus have said that would have been more Epicurean?

I come next to the 7th paragraph and my reply to it will comprize also the 8th, 9th, and 10th paragraphs. I think it completely unphilosophical to infer more than experience and analogy in the works of nature, or any other works, warrant and I will again take the watch which has suited Mr. H.'s purpose so well. I infer from its construction, that it had a maker. This I gather from experience and analogy; not because I saw that particular watch go through the process of making; but, because I have been in workshops

* Wanting in the M. S.

where I have seen different sorts of machinery preparing and applied to purposes similar to those of the movements in a watch; and though I have never beheld the process of preparing every individual part; yet having observed the result, when the whole was completed, I feel no hesitation in believing the fact of its making. I might go to China and there see a sort of machinery completely new to me; yet, from what I had seen and known of machinery at home, I should directly infer it to be the work of a machinist. In the case of living animals, the case is extremely different; we have not the slightest knowledge of the making of any single being, and had watches derived their existence from generation or vegetation, we should have had no more right to conclude that the first watch was made by an unknown incomprehensible being, than we have that such a being made the first man and woman. The savage, who found the watch, was not so unphilosophical in his reasoning, as Mr. H. wishes to infer. Until experience or analogy had taught him that its movements were caused by some being foreign to and distinct from itself, he had no right to conclude otherwise than he did. Had an oyster and a watch been placed before him at once, and both equally new objects to him, how would it be possible for him to determine that the oyster exhibited greater ingenuity in its contrivance, than the watch? If he referred the cause of either of them to a being superior to himself, he would doubtless choose the watch as exhibiting marks of greater skill. For though a man perfectly acquainted with the mechanism of a watch can easily account for its movements, yet it is rather hard to charge the poor savage with stupidity; because he cannot draw the same inference, when he has not a single item of the requisite knowledge. In the case of *man*, I will, for the sake of argument, admit that there may be beings who have witnessed the creation or making of *man*; and to these the process may appear quite easy, and the proof of the commencement of his existence as evident to them as that of a watch to a watch maker; but without such information, from such a witness, as may satisfy my mind, why must I, like the poor savage, be ridiculed and derided for my scepticism, by beings who do not possess an atom of intelligence on the subject more than myself? In the 9th paragraph Mr. H. has been very liberal of his sarcasms upon the *Atomic* philosopher, whom, on my having assumed as a signature, the name of the founder of that philosophy, he supposes me to represent. But as sarcasm is no part of

argument, I shall not notice it at present, any further than to remind Mr. H. of a very homely proverb, which recommends no one to throw stones who possesses glass windows. Though he disputes that matter and motion can produce the appearance in nature, yet it will be beyond Mr. H.'s power to point out one single fact, wherein matter and motion are unconcerned, or where they are not the sole agents; and as to asserting, that matter and motion are only instruments in the hands of an almighty incomprehensible being, it is assuming the point in dispute. Something must be eternal. Why may not matter in motion be this self-existent eternal being? Many divines embarrassed with the theory of the creation of matter out of nothing, have admitted their belief in its eternal existence, but contend for the necessity of an intelligent being to account for its orderly arrangement. Did nothing but order, harmony and beauty pervade the universe, there would *then* be no proof of the existence of such a being; for the whole might arise from a principle of order in matter itself, but when disorder, discord and deformity make up so great a portion of the works of nature, it seems a far more probable hypothesis to refer the whole to the operation of a general unintelligent principle pervading and directing it. It has frequently been laid down as the height of absurdity to suppose an infinite succession of finite causes and effects, but the absurdity will diminish considerably on a close examination of the proposition couched in the supposition. Every thing which is finite or limited in its duration, we have been told, has a beginning and an end; and in the case of man, we will suppose every succeeding man to follow the birth of the preceding at an interval of thirty years; but as thirty years is only a finite portion of duration, it will follow they say, that no number of finite portions will ever amount to an infinity of duration, and that, let whatever number of men, we choose, to have successively existed, yet as the portion of time the life of one would occupy, would be finite, the duration of the existence of the whole would also be finite, for no number of finites can make an infinite. This argument has had considerable reliance placed upon it from the apparent dilemma in which it involves the hypothesis of an infinite succession of causes and effects; but we shall, I trust, get clear of both the horns. No one will deny that the possibility of men and women being generated from this time to eternity, because we can easily suppose that it may happen for 100 years forwards, and there is as little difficulty in extending the period to

1000 years. And at the end of the latter period, shall we find it a whit less possible to conceive generation to proceed to any assignable period? Nay, conceive it (which is as much within the limit of possibility as the first supposition) to have proceeded to the last limit that can be numbered, yet we see no reason for saying that *here* successive generation must stop; in fact we feel that such an assertion would be absurd. Well, then, if it be possible that successive generation may exist beyond any assignable period, it may exist through eternity to come, it may have existed through a past eternity. There is no more difficulty in the one supposition than the other. Any hypothesis as to the production of animals by any changes or convulsions in the globe are more conjectural than probable, and when reared, independent of facts, rest upon very sandy foundations, but the reasoning just insisted on, is as logical as metaphysics will allow.

I am surprised that Mr. H. should represent matter as an inert substance, which possesses within itself neither form nor activity, when the discoveries of natural philosophers have proved that there is no part, but is in a state of activity; that every part of matter is in motion; that it is never, for a single instant, at rest; and that motion is inseparably connected with, and evidently one of its properties. Indeed, what is motion without matter? Nothing. *Matter and motion*, I have no hesitation in affirming, though I may be sneered at, *do to all appearance, arrange between them, the events and circumstances of eternal ages, and the order and disorder of a boundless universe, uniting in themselves both causes and effects; both of them passive, yet both active, both insensible but neither as a whole intelligent.*

In the 11th paragraph Mr. H. expresses his agreement with me in the proposition, that it is man's interest to be virtuous; but he does not think that he who understands his interest best is most virtuous, and asserts that the prospect of a future reward is a very important if not absolutely necessary, stimulus, even to a virtuous mind. He accuses me of interpolating a passage of his with the words "*(to a well constituted mind)*" which he protests against, as giving an unfair version of the original text. He acquits me of an intentional interpolation, for which I feel obliged to him, as nothing was farther from my intention than taking any unfair advantage. But on turning to the third paragraph of Mr. H.'s lecture, I find the following words. "*It is, say these philosophers, a man's present interest to be virtuous; and the consciousness of acting right, is an ample reward*

TO A WELL CONSTITUTED MIND." And this position he immediately attempts to disprove as a reference to his lecture will shew, and will fully justify my version of the text. And though he does not attempt to prove "that the consciousness of integrity (*to a well constituted mind*) without the prospect of future reward would be an *insufficient* stimulus to virtuous conduct, yet he takes some pains to prove that it is *NOT sufficient*, and I cannot yet distinguish the difference in the meaning. He says that there is an essential difference between requiring a *stimulus* to virtue, and being *charmed* with vice. To a person perfectly aware of the advantages of virtue and the evil consequences of vice, the latter could have no charms for him, for the connexion would appear so inseparable that it would destroy all inclination that might be produced by its inviting appearance. A man passionately fond of fruit would not taste of the most luscious grapes, if he knew that the indulgence of his appetite would cause the amputation of a limb. Virtue, to a person properly apprized of its great advantages, will appear so charming, as to render any other stimulus unnecessary.

In the 12th paragraph, Mr. H. appears to understand the word knowledge in a sense very different to that in which I use it. I do not look upon literature as synonymous with knowledge, nor think a person ignorant because he is illiterate. I think a man may be a great linguist or an eminent mathematician, and be very deficient in that sort of science which includes a correct knowledge of his own interest. I admit that literature and the sciences are calculated to increase greatly both the mental and physical enjoyments of their possessors, but high, very high, attainments in them are not always accompanied with a knowledge of the science of morals; but when a man's acquisitions include the whole, he will be a very useful and happy man indeed. He will be virtuous in a very superior degree, and I therefore maintain that virtue and knowledge are inseparable; so also are vice and ignorance; that the generality of believers meet death more with apprehension and fear than with hope and joy, Mr. H. says is a very broad and bold assertion, but directly contrary to history, observation and fact. I for my part, am perfectly willing to abide by their decision. I have read the history of Christian martyrs and confessors, and I have also read of the martyrs and confessors of other religions and those of no religion at all. And what does the whole prove? that the feelings of men and women may be excited to any pitch and by almost any means. If the

martyrdom, or joyous death of a Christian is to be cited as a proof of the strong hope of a future reward, I suppose that the hope of the poor wretch who throws himself beneath the wheels of the car of the bloody and obscene Lingam of Hindostan, or that of the North American Savage, who sings under his tortures and insultingly defies the malice and ingenuity of his tormentors, will be equally just and well founded. But amidst the thousands and tens of thousands who have triumphed in the glorious prospect of future reward, the millions of believers who cling to life with the tenacity of despair and die with doubt and apprehension, are thrown aside in the calculation. Religion is the offspring of fear, and is inseparable from its parent. If I take my argument from history, observation, and facts, I am directly told to separate christianity from its corruptions and the wicked practices of bad men which Mr. H. says do not belong to or result from those exalted doctrines which breathe nothing but the purest love to God and man. In my reply to the 5th paragraph, I shewed that these doctrines are not so pure in their breathings as is here asserted, and though especial regard may be exhibited in them towards the deity, yet the happiness of man is clearly of very subordinate importance. But why must I be compelled to take Christianity otherwise than I find it, a mass of institutions, and practices, which have been the curse and degradation of mankind. Paganism, Mahometanism, Brahminism, nay every superstition, that ever infested man would have nothing but excellent qualities in it, if we take away all that is vicious. Henbane would most probably be a nourishing plant if its deleterious properties were extracted. Martyrdom itself proves nothing, but the sincerity and enthusiasm of the martyr, nay in some cases it will not prove even that, for some have fled from martyrdom, whom *shame* has brought back to the stake in order to recover a lost reputation. Some men notoriously vicious have suffered martyrdom in the early ages of Christianity, it being believed by great numbers, that it purged the sinner of all crime and was an immediate passport to immortality. And though it may be admitted that the prospect of future reward *did* excite to martyrdom; yet, in how few instances can it be proved that such prospect was an incentive to a moral and virtuous life! The reader of "Middleton's Free Inquiry" and the "Ecclesiastical History of Mosheim," will find my opinions supported by the record of undisputed facts.

Mr. H. in his 13th paragraph says, "it really seems use-

less, and in fact almost impossible, to reason with one, who can see no beauty, nor order, nor design, nor beneficial tendency, and but little of enjoyment and happiness either in the natural or the moral world," &c. Let us not mistake one another. I am not aware that my words will bear the inference Mr. H.'s words imply. I can see beauty, order, apparent design, &c. &c. but along with these I perceive deformity, disorder, want of design, maleficent tendency, pain and misery; and how can an impartial observer conclude that their author is a being of infinite power and benevolence? "What can we reason but from what we know," and such an inference is as unphilosophical, as would be that of a courtier, who should declare his king to be full of kindness and beneficence, because the parasites of the palace revelled in luxury wrung from the toil and slavery of millions. What have exceptions to a rule to do in a system framed by an infinitely wise, and powerful being? Checks and counterpoises to the man who is guided by experience and analogy seem the natural result of the action of matter upon matter, sometimes apparently, without design, as in storms, eruptions, inundations, &c., and at other times designed by intelligence, as in the case of a clock or a steam engine. I am again very glad that the clock seems as much to M. H.'s mind as the watch, and admit all that he has said about it, as well as the steam engine, and think they prove a great share of ingenuity in the contriver. But even in these two cases, it is well known to those acquainted with their history, how little can be placed to the credit of design and how much to that of mere accident.

In the the 14th paragraph a reference is made to the machinery of the solar system, upon which I see no necessity for remark, except as to the observation that but for the wise contrivance of the centripetal and centrifugal forces, wild motion (*one of the atomic deities*) would, if unrestrained, necessarily hurry them all into the boundless regions of space. Are we not already there? if not, where are we? Having no experience upon the subject and no analogy for a guide, I cannot, like Mr. H. take upon me to say what would be the consequence of the want of these two forces or of either of them, but if our system were really to be carried into the boundless regions of space, I should be glad to be informed how our situation would then differ from our present. I suppose the principal difference would be as to our revolution round the sun, but my experience tells me that pious Optimists would clearly discover any situation to

be the very best possible, it being, of course, contrived by infinite wisdom. The Pietist of the moon can doubtless demonstrate the advantages which the inhabitants of the Hemisphere of that orb, which is always turned from the earth, enjoy from the invariable nightly darkness which is the consequence of the exact monthly motion of that satellite upon its axis. It is supposed by some astronomers that all the planetary satellites in our system are subject to the same law as our moon, and, if so, they will all have the like benefit of one hemisphere of each never facing its primary. While I am upon the subject of design I shall just notice that anatomists point out numerous parts in the construction of animals which answer no purpose whatever; I shall merely mention one instance which every one will understand, the breasts and nipples of the human male species. I have next to complain of a violent perversion both of my words and meaning, where Mr. H. says "But when your correspondent, Leucippus, has asserted that a clock-maker would be ashamed of introducing checks and counterpoises to his machinery, he very cavalierly adds, I feel here no necessity for argument, and leave this paragraph, as I am sure it will be, to its own confutation." In referring to my answer to the sixth paragraph of Mr. H.'s lecture (where he had said that "without the constant superintendence of infinite wisdom, some of the most common agents in nature would acquire such a predominating influence, as would involve the universal system in disorder and ruin") I find my words to be "what has the all-wise creator so formed the world, that if left to itself it has a tendency to nothing but disorder and ruin? A clock maker would be ashamed if such a charge could be established against his work." Now what is the obvious meaning of all this? Why that the clock maker would be ashamed if he could not leave his work without its falling into disorder and ruin; not of introducing checks and counterpoises into the machinery. I am very willing to suppose that Mr. H.'s misrepresentation of my argument has been undesigned, but I cannot afford in this case to be as generous as he professed to be in another, but must insist upon retaining both my own words and my own inferences. Having made these observations, I yet feel no necessity for argument, but am inclined to leave the field without changing either the MOOD or tense of the verb which Mr. H. has so liberally put into my mouth. The two next paragraphs do not seem to require any observation after what I have already said; for though I may

be considered but a poor natural philosopher, the question as to the existence of evil in a system under the management of an infinitely powerful, wise, and good being is still unsolved. The remarks in the latter paragraph appear to be intended to get rid of the difficulty with which miracles embarrass the system of revelation, by substituting the possible hypothesis of their being consistent with the general laws of nature.

Not being a Cartesian, I feel no anxiety on seeing either the celebrated Frenchman or his system of vortices ridiculed, though, if it be similar to that contained in "Philips's theory of the universe" I must say it appears to me quite as probable as Newton's famous theory of projectile and attractive forces." I am not aware that Mr. Frend has published any theory; though, I am of opinion that he has used unanswerable arguments against the doctrine of attraction as generally received.

I shall now reply to the remaining paragraphs, and I do not desire to offend Mr. H. when I say that I derived considerable amusement from the perusal of the two first of them. In the heat of argument, he seems to have forgotten his much insisted upon doctrine of future rewards, which he has represented as so animating to the believer. If I am not under a mistake, these future rewards are synonymous with the much desired and much vaunted Heaven of which so much has been written and so little understood. Suppose for an instant, that this Heaven, the object of the Christian's wishes, the place where the wicked cease from troubling and where the weary are at rest, where sorrow and pain will never enter, but where there is nothing but unmixed enjoyment, to be a reality; it seems, from Mr. H.'s pleasant jeers, that it is a place or a state not worth seeking after. He has no notion that a world without earthquakes or storms, wars, pestilence or famine, religious corruption or moral darkness, sickness or death, or even the rheumatism or toothache, would be at all desirable. Now is it not strange, that the very heaven which is so much recommended from the pulpits of every sect is described as deriving a great portion of its bliss from these negative excellencies. And if we are to have stomachs, one of the usual properties of living bodies, I fancy, it would form no particular objection to this celestial country, if the land there did actually produce corn and wine and oil, and all other luxuries in abundance, spontaneously. I never met with the believer of any sect except the Swedenborgians, who professed an intention or desire to labour in a future world, and even the Swedenborgians themselves are only

for employing themselves according to their inclinations, so that I fear their productions in that place will afford a very trifle for consumption. If passions, or nerves, or teeth, cannot exist without producing misery and pain to the possessor, he had better be destitute of them. Some divines tell us that the deity is a being without these and yet that his happiness is infinite, and if so, I cannot conceive why a man or a woman may not also be very happy without them. To be sure they would be different beings from us; but if they were happy, of what consequence is that, I do most certainly contend that imperfection in the works of any being argues a deficiency of power or skill in that being, and I should be glad, once more, to be informed by what mode of reasoning I am to infer perfection from imperfect results. The deity Mr. H. thinks, might, if his operations were confined to one path, make a universe perfect as a whole, but it would lose all the variety and beauty of its component parts, among which I suppose would be *pain want and misery*, for he says it would then present only one vast monotonous melancholy scene of inactive intellect and virtue, of drowsy quietness and passive enjoyment. Since I read this short passage, I have endeavoured to form an idea how a scene of enjoyment could be a melancholy one, but I am unable to imagine such a picture. If the monotony be the principal objection to the enjoyment, that objection certainly cannot be raised to our present mode of existence; for there is a sufficiently frequent intervention of misery and as much variety of it, the most determined Optimist can reasonably desire. I thought enjoyment was enjoyment, but it seems I was under a mistake and that Heaven will be no Heaven without a *quantum sufficit* of pain and calamity to rouse us from our drowsy quietness, and excite our intellect to activity. Well! this Heaven of Mr. H.'s is the strangest I ever heard or thought of, and I think will suit neither Unitarians or any other sect. The Heaven which is usually delineated to us, and, which I dare say, will upon recollection be more to Mr. H.'s own taste, is such a one as I have previously alluded to, from which care and pain, want and sorrow, disease and death are shut out, and of which the positive fruition is said to exceed all comprehension, and this life we are told is merely a state of probation and a passage to immortality—and but for the evils of this we should not be able to set a proper value on our future happiness. But an all knowing deity could have no occasion to try his creatures; he would be perfectly aware what would be their respective

No. 11. Vol. XII.

conduct; and therefore the probationary period is so much time thrown away, and so much gratuitous misery inflicted, prior to rendering them happy. Add to this, that a great part of the human race die in their infancy; and what sort of a state of probation can theirs be? Does the torture of the Gripes, the pain of teething, the agony of convulsions contribute to make infants appreciate a happy futurity any better? If the deity be all powerful as well as wise, he can as easily make his creatures happy and competent to enjoy happiness now as at the end of 70 or 80 years of a chequered existence. I should certainly be prone to inquire why all men (under the management of an infinitely perfect being) were not exactly of the same height and size of the same complexion and features, all handsome strong and wise alike; why all the women were not equally beautiful, modest and learned; why the males were not all sages, and the females all *bas bleus* (blue stockings) if it could be proved against me that either I, or the atomic philosophers, had insisted upon these circumstances as essentially requisite to happiness; but, as neither I nor they contend that enjoyment is impossible with a variety of height, size complexion, features, strength and beauty, I can feel no force in Mr. H.'s attempts at ridicule. He says, he should prefer being *almost* frozen to death in the remote regions of the Georgiam Sidus to living in the *max-kish* assemblage he has pourtrayed. I have no business to quarrel with Mr. H.'s taste, but I cannot help thinking that there would be a pleasure in any assemblage where there was nothing but happiness. He has here thrown a slur upon the poor cold inhabitants of the Georgiam Sidus, and had he had occasion to mention mercury he would have pitied the mercurians for being compelled to suffer the heat of their boiling hot climate. Now, I am so liberal in my notions, that I imagine it within the compass of possibility that the animals upon every planet, primary and secondary, nay even upon the comets and the sun itself, may be all equally happy, and so far from thinking variety any obstacle to enjoyment, it seems to me that happiness would be increased by it. My objection is not to varieties of ingredients in happiness, but to its being mixed up with pain, either monotonous or varied.

In the 19th paragraph we are told, that the circumstances of the world and the appearances around us do not afford the slightest shadow of a ground for the unbeliever's un-

warrantable assumption that the deity *cannot* or *will not* prevent evil; but that on the contrary he *can* and *will*, and *does*;" "that we are very frequently entirely mistaken in our estimate of evil;" and that misery and suffering are excluded by the general rule, which general and obvious rule of the divine government in the earth, he says in the 20th paragraph, is the preponderance of happiness and enjoyment. It is calculated by political economists that about three in every five of the children born in populous districts die in the first year of their childhood from different disorders, and that in some of the poorest and most wretched neighbourhoods, nearly nine out of ten die in the first year at the foundling hospital in Paris where from 7000 to 8000 infants are annually received, only 180 were left alive at the age of ten. I was going to say, look at the suffering in the East and West Indies, of the great bulk of the population, but I have no occasion to go so far; London, Manchester, Glasgow, nay even our own town, Bradford, will furnish us with misery enough. How many out of a population of above 13,000, before the present turn out for wages, toiled from an early hour in the morning till late at night, almost, without intermission, for a bare existence? Much above half, and a great part of them young children. Who that has a heart can behold the poor trembling creatures dragged out of their beds by five o'clock in the morning, scarcely awake, and destined to be immured in a close unwholesome manufactory for twelve or 14 hours daily, without execrating a system that produces such unnatural scenes! Look at the weaver, who by a close and incessant labour can earn about fifteen shillings a week upon which he has very probably a wife and two or three small children to support. See the comber exposed, in a heated atmosphere, to the noxious fumes of charcoal, and every nerve and muscle stretched to its full pitch of bearing, besides being obliged in the course of his toil to sustain the extremes of heat and cold at short and sudden intervals. And what does he undergo in this slavish employment and waste of life for? For a Guinea or eighteen shillings a week, with which he can barely support himself and family. Look at the immense mass of suffering arising from poverty in Ireland, and diseases every where; battles of Waterloo, and Russian campaigns! And are all these proofs of the existence of a beneficent deity? The exceptions to the general rule are so numerous and multiplied that I think the exceptions are more likely to be considered the rule, and the rule the exception. The un-

warrantable assumption appears to me to belong to those who make the assertion that *that the deity does exclude evil*, either by the general rule or any other rule. But he asks, "is the benevolent governor of the universe to be charged with the consequences of the pride and folly of men, who rush together in arms, and slaughter each other in the field of battle?" But I refer the reader to the whole of the 20th paragraph, where in the majority of cases, it seems, man *himself* is the *voluntary* instrument of his own sufferings. But I had before been given to understand that the whole of the events in nature were under the controul of a wise and benevolent being, and that they were necessary to his general plan, and consequently could not be expected to be otherwise. I am however, willing to acknowledge my error and to acquit the deity of as much of the charge of evil as Mr. H. thinks proper, but even in that case, he must deduct considerably from his supposed attributes of infinite power wisdom and goodness, or some one of them. My arguments are intended to apply to a being to whom absolute and unlimited perfection is assigned and not to a limited and imperfect one. Many of the evils of life, it is said, are imaginary. I do not think that this circumstance detracts from the misery they cause; for if the mind be pained, the affliction is real, and where the imagination lends its boundless power to create or increase the evil, nothing can exceed its extent as for instance, in the torments of unfounded jealousy. The part of this paragraph where the esquimaux, the hottentot and the city alderman are introduced, instead of helping my antagonist, appears to me, to assist my argument; for it proves that, even constituted as we are, happiness may exist in the greatest and most extreme variety, and that in order to make us all happy, it will not be necessary to reduce us all to a torpid monotony of enjoyment, nor to make the men all sages and the women all *bas bleus*, seeing that a snow cabin, with whale oil and blubber, will give pleasure to the Esquimaux; a stinking kraal and a buffalo's raw entrails to the hottentot, while turtle soup and venison will be a luxury to the Alderman. But Mr. H. has insisted that evil is necessary, and I maintain that it is unnecessary, and bespeaks a deficiency in the power, wisdom or goodness of that being who it is pretended manages the affairs of the universe. Pain and want, the only things that visit us, spontaneously, without exertion on our parts, are unmixed evils; satisfaction and pleasure are artificial and factitious, and can only be obtained by

labour, which is another evil. So that enjoyment must be the production of the individual, while suffering and privation are the unsolicited gifts of the bountiful father of mankind, and can only be removed or alleviated by the lesser evil, labour—it may probably be disputed that labour is an evil, but that it is, will be easy of proof; no one would labour, for the sake of labour; it is always undertaken to remove some evil or to procure some good; it is the indispensable condition of ease and pleasure, and on that account only do we apply to it. Were it good, were pleasurable sensation inseparably connected with it, it would not be necessary for so *profound* a statesman, as was my Lord Castlereagh, to suggest the propriety of compelling *Burkes Swinish Multitude* to dig holes one day and to fill them up the next; for labour of itself would be pleasant, and this or some other equally useless employment would be their own choice.

I have now replied to Mr. H.'s remarks, on every point, that seems to me, material to the question at issue, but whether satisfactorily or not is for others to determine; but as the attributes of the Theist's and Christian's deity, have been the principal subject of consideration, the existence of such a being has not been argued, otherwise than incidentally. I will, however, in conclusion, offer an argument on the subject, which I do not remember ever to have seen. This being is represented as infinitely wise and powerful, and also as omnipotent or existing every where. I will here repeat what I have so often insisted on, that to reason philosophically, we must not travel beyond the regions of experience and analogy. Well then, what do these teach us respecting intelligence? that it is never found separate from an organized form, every idea we have of it is invariably in connexion with organization. We also find that sensation is necessary to its production and existence, that it grows, improves, decays and dies, and consequently is no self-existent substance. If we follow this train of reasoning and apply it to the deity, what is the necessary inference? Why that being intelligent, he must possess organization and sensation, but if he be organized he must possess figure: but if he be figured, he must be limited; and if limited his ubiquity is gone and there is an end to his infinity. And if sensation be one of his properties, he may be acted upon by objects distinct and separate from himself and he will be subject to change of feeling, and his immutability will no longer exist. And as sensation is, as far as we have expe-

rience, the cause of passions, he will be subject to hope, fear, joy, sorrow, and all the train of pleasurable and painful emotions which alternately elate and depress the spirits of all other sentient organized beings. I might pursue the argument much farther but as no Theist or Christian will be content with a deity, shorn of his infinity, I will for the present close the discussion.

Whether Mr. H. will rejoin or not to these remarks, is a matter which I must leave to himself. I wish the controversy to be continued both for the information of myself and those persons who may feel interested in the subject. And though my engagements are, I believe as imperative as those of my antagonist, I do not hesitate to promise that while I have opportunity, I will not fail to give his future observations, if any appear, my early consideration and notice,

I am, Sir,

yours respectfully,

LEUCIPPUS.

Note.—In conjunction with the foregoing masterly reply and complete refutation of Mr. Heineken's arguments for an intelligent and all designing deity, I will notice, for the satisfaction of my Bradford Friends, that their last subscription never came to hand, so as to admit of an acknowledgement: though I have not a doubt but that it was accidentally lost, lost too in a parcel for which we recovered the value, as far, at the time, as we knew its value, not knowing that it contained a parcel with cash. The circumstance was this. The subscription was very properly entrusted to Mr. Smithson of Leeds. He had two parcels to send to London, this from Bradford with other monies, and one to go round to Sheffield by our Sheffield Parcel. He inadvertently tied both together, and the directions of the wrong on the outside, so that the whole was forwarded to Sheffield; and in going to Sheffield from London the Hope Coach lost all its parcels. We are certain of this, as we had the same account from Nottingham, and recovered for both, as far as we knew the value at the time. There was also a subscription for the men in Newgate and others from other parts of Yorkshire. The total of cash was from 6 to 7£. We all feel under equal obligations to the subscribers, as if it had come safe. It is one of those accidents in the business of life which Mr. Heineken's God has very badly managed, or does not well look after, even with reference to his idolators.

R. C.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

DEAR SIR,

BEING an admirer of your principles, of course, a reader of the Republican, I may add, a staunch Atheist, I beg leave to inform you of a circumstance which has taken place in Enfield Town on Sunday 21st August last. A religious and merciless monster, in the shape of a human animal, named William Heath, wilfully and maliciously and with intent, came out of his house to his gate, which is about four feet high, and cut over with a horse-whip-handle at a little boy not seven years of age. The weal which he caused, began on the crown of the boy's head and extended downwards, laying open the cheek and neck just before the ear, to the length of four or five inches. The blood ran down on the child's shirt frill, from a wound completely deprived of skin, more than half an inch wide.

The father, D. Beauchamp, complained to Heath of treating a child in so brutish a manner, who said, he would learn them to keep away from his premises.

The father took his complaint to a magistrate, Peter Hardy, Esq. of the town, which gave rise to a few singular observations on your name and principles, which I will state as correctly as I can.

On the Monday following, the worthy magistrate summoned W. Heath to appear before him at seven o'clock P. M., which he was unable to do, in consequence of coming home abominably drunk about six o'clock. He apologized the next morning (Tuesday) and promised to attend in the evening at seven o'clock.

All parties being present, the magistrate began by stating to Heath the charge against him, which he did not deny.

Of course, Mr. Hardy informed him that he must find bail for the sessions or satisfy the parties injured.

Heath said, I will not give one farthing; for Beauchamp only wants to extort money from me. Mr. Hardy observed:-- Beauchamp has not asked any as yet, nor do I know what he will require; but I should expect to pay a sovereign at least, for such an assault.

Heath replied, not a farthing, Sir, and produced two housekeepers as his bail, Mr. Carter and Mr. Valentine. Carter privately informed Heath, that Beauchamp was an Atheist and did not believe in the Lord Jesus Christ.

Heath instantly acquainted his worship of it, and thought it right that Beauchamp should be examined as to his belief in the Christian doctrine.

Mag.—Beauchamp, do you believe in the book you have in your hand?

Beau.—What do you mean by belief your worship?

Mag.—That book is the Testament, and do you believe it contains a true account of the birth, life and death of Christ, and that he is the son of God, who laid down his *life* to save us from hell?

Beau.—As much as I know of it to be true, so much I believe.

Mag.—As much as I know to be true?

Beau.—Your worship, do you wish me to swear that that book is all truth? So help me God, I will not; for I know nothing of the author that wrote it.

Mag.—Do you believe that the History of England is true?

Beau.—I know no more than I read about tyrant kings and slavish subjects.

Mag.—Do you believe those king's did exist at the time mentioned?

Beau.—It is possible that they did; but I merely give credit to the name of the author of the work. I know nothing, whether he was a whig, a tory, or a radical; therefore, I cannot tell which way he might have leaned. But, your worship, I do know George the Fourth, I have seen him, and I hope for protection from one of the magistrates appointed under him; or am I to understand, that an Atheist cannot be protected in this country?

Mag.—I will endeavour to make you understand how the law stands on that point, Beauchamp. In the first place, you complain against Mr. Heath, and if you do not believe in the existence of a God, how can I swear you? How shall I take hold of your faith? And, as the law begins to act from the oath of the plaintiff, I must dismiss the defendant unless you say you are a Christian.

Beau.—Then, your worship, I must imagine a something out of nothing and call it a God, although I cannot define one letter of the word; or be an unprotected subject of his Majesty.

Mag.—What religion are you, Beauchamp? Are you a Christian?

Beau.—I was born and brought up a Christian.

Mag.—What reason have you Mr. Carter or Mr. Heath, to suppose he is not a Religionist?

Carter.—One evening, in close conversation with Mr. Beauchamp, he seemed to object to all the prodigious or miraculous parts of the Gospel, and said, they were not sufficiently explained for him to rely on them for his salvation; but, as he was at all times a learner, he most willingly gathered information from every person he talked to.

Mag.—Did you say he denied the Gospel, Mr. Carter?

Carter.—No, your worship; but he seemed not to believe it, or I thought so.

Mag.—Do you know any thing about him, Mr. Heath?

Heath.—I know, Sir, that he often works of a Sunday, mending his carts and harness, and neither his wife nor he has been to church since they have been my neighbours.

Beau.—That is a very poor observation, Heath, of my breaking the Sabbath, when you know I have seen you, many times cleaning your horse and harness and stable. And on Sunday last, you reached over your gate, and, with a horse whip, broke the sabbath and the peace too of our Sovereign Lord the King, by inflicting a dreadful wound on my infant son, you psalm singer!

Mag.—As for working on the Sunday, Mr. Heath, I make an allowance for him. He is a poor man, and if he happens to break any of his implements of trade, on the Saturday, he is justifiable in repairing, in order to be able to pursue his vocation on the Monday, as he has a large family to support and bears an excellent character. I have never heard any person say that he neglected his duty as a father.

Beau.—It may be thought, Sir, a presuming declaration that I am about to make; but I will here, before your worship, make a fair challenge to any person, who can lay a charge of immorality against me for the last 20 years or more, of my time, so I will take a text out of your gospel book, that you may be able to judge between Heath and me “by their fruits ye shall know them.”

Mag.—Yes, it is possible to be a moral man, and yet not to believe the gospel.

Beau.—I think, your worship, that my neighbours have no right to find fault with my principles, as I put it out of their power to show me disorderly or unneighbourly.

Mag.—O yes! they have an undoubted right to call in question your religious opinions, while you dwell among

them, for their own safety¹; for, in my opinion, it is impossible that a man can be a good man unless he is a religious man, and that a christian too.

Beau.—Your worship, suppose I was to say that I was a Jew. The Jews do not beleive in the Lord Jesus Christ, as Heath does; they believe in Jehovah.

Mag.—Well, then I should swear them on the Bible, which would be sufficiently binding to them; but to swear that fellow, Carlile, or any of his opinions on the holy scriptures, would be of no use; for that Carlile is a fellow, if I could have my will of him, I would sweep him off the earth? Some of those fellows would stamp the Bible underfoot, What company do you keep Beauchamp? Do you know that Bickley in Blue Buildings? He denies the Bible and Testament too. The other day, Mrs, Bickley, his wife, came to me to lay a complaint against a person, and, before I took her oath, I asked her if she believed in the gospel. She said she did; but that her husband did not believe a word of it.

Beau.—Your worship, I never identify myself with any sect or party; neither at prayer meetings nor love feasts, but I am always free to join in conversation with any man, who appears to have intellect to advance any thing of useful knowledge. I never saw Mr. Carlile, but I have heard that he is a very good man.

Mag.—A good man! Why sometime back, I recollect seeing some of his blasphemous publications, where it said that God Almighty was a fool, to damn the whole human race for no other crime than the eating of an apple².

Beau.—That, Sir, is an observation of Mr. Paine's, which Mr. Carlile published in the account of his Mock Trial for selling the Age of Reason; and since that, I have been very shy of praising Christianity, lest I should be laughed at by the sensible part of the people. Sir James Macintosh says, in his pamphlet, that the people stand in no need of Church

¹ And why has not Beauchamp a right to call theirs in question?

R. C.

² Mr. Hardy would not repeat that after an hours conversation with Carlile, and I invite him to come and try it, promising him as much civility, at least, as he shewed to Mr. Beauchamp.

R. C.

³ I save myself from all such ridiculous expressions or arguments, by shewing that there is no god almighty, with capacities to play any such pranks. If there were such a god, I would endeavour to make him wiser.

R. C.

teaching any longer, and thinks they may dispense with the establishment.

Mag.—Why sometime ago, I saw an account of a parson wanting a coal merchant to apply to the devil to obtain the order to serve him with coals, supposing him to have a very large fire in Hell, as they pretend the scriptures inform us⁴. If they do not believe holy writ themselves, it is very unkind of them to prevent us from thinking the Bible true⁵; for we have nothing else to rely upon. They take all our comfort away and give us nothing in return, seeing we have nothing to rest on whatever but the Bible—no promise of future happiness in the next world, for our good doing in this. The lower order of ignorant men, of little schooling, are easily caught by these Atheists; for, when they read the Bible, it contains many passages which cannot be understood by us, nor does god mean that we should understand it all:—so they directly conclude that it is priestcraft, and call on us to prove it true. That is impossible, for no man can say the Bible is all truth: we only believe it and it cannot do us any harm, nor the Atheist; for when we die and meet in the next world⁶, I think it will not be any cause of unhappiness to the Atheist or the Christian, to have believed the gospel.

Beau.—Yes, your worship, as I am a dealer in that article coals, it may turn out very profitable; for the Testament, gives us an account of an everlasting fire, and you say you believe.

Heath.—I know Mr. Hardy, that Beauchamp has many times in Enfield openly and publicly denied the truth of the Bible and Testament too: and such a fellow as he should not be allowed to take an oath, to hold such a respectable person as I am to bail to the quarter Sessions.

Beau.—I never publicly harangued an audience in my life; I do not think my ability great enough; but I may have talked of something which your mud-head cannot understand.

⁴ Mr. Hardy, at least, seems to have a religion that is tempered with good humour. I have a sort of notion, that he is only politically and managerially a religionist. R. C.

⁵ We cannot prevent any thing of the kind. Believe and damn yourselves in this life, if you like: we will neither believe nonsense nor fear your damnation in the next. The fault is, that ignorant men in power, the truly wicked, Mr. Hardy, call on more intelligent men to believe that which is repugnant to all reason, and for no other reason whatever, than because immense profits are associated with it and desired to be preserved. R. C.

⁶ What is the next world? R. C.

Mag.—Why, Mr. Heath, I have put every question I can think of to Mr. Beauchamp, and he has given me such answers as prove him to be a Christian; I cannot legally refuse to take his oath:—and what is more, Beauchamp, I will not hesitate to say before these gentlemen, this evening, whether you are a believer in the gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ or not, you are a sensible man and I must not refuse you an oath, so take up the book and I will swear you.

Beau.—When I come to trial, your worship, I expect Mr. Heath's counsel will question me severely as to my faith.

Mag.—Yes, undoubtedly, Beauchamp, he will prepare his counsel with such argument as to endeavour to destroy yours. But you need not fear the greatest counsellor in London; you are prepared to answer all the questions he can ask, for you well understand the matter.

Then the worthy magistrate proceeded to bind Heath in two sureties of £20. each, to appear at the Sessions 12th of September to answer to the assault.

T. P.

TO RICHARD CARLILE DORCHESTER GAOL.

ESTEEMED FRIEND.

London 3rd day 9th month.

As thou hast at length effectually stormed the strong hold of my deep rooted and long standing prejudices, I can no longer desist from giving to thee a candid assurance of my conversion and ardent attachment to Materialism. After having been only eighteen months under thy, not magic, but material wand, the immaterial non-entities, which had been thirty years growing on my mind have totally disappeared; in spite of attending church twice every Sunday, singing the hundredth psalm, Jehovah reigns, Glory be to thee &c. &c., and rehearsing all the stagnant dogmatical humbug and parasitical fulsomeness of Mother Church, even unto loathing. This confession is what is due to thee from hundreds, and it is a confession which ought to be made by all who are in my situation, and which would be made, did not the cruel illiberality of the base and the ignorant implicitly debar them from speaking the honest effusions of the mind. "THE BIBLE HAS LONG BEEN THE GAOLER OF TRUTH," but mankind will ever long throw off the mask and speak out. I only wonder that the old hag should so long elevate her gorgon head and that men of independant fortunes should still continue

to bring their sons up to the church. The whore of Babylon and the mummery of England have passed their Zenith; we can measure their altitude; we can anticipate their fall; and that with confidence. That fall they have facilitated by their mutual recriminations and accusations of falsehood and of fraud.

Can it be supposed that men, possessing extensive scientific and literary knowledge, can be so far blinded, as to believe the monstrous absurdities of the Christian Religion. Impossible! Not believing what they so strenuously advocate, they mischievously and wickedly palm it upon the ignorant; for the purpose of emolument. We may fairly accuse them of being the really wicked. 'Tis they who reign the hecate of domestic hells. 'Tis I who have felt it, and it is I who am now an alien from my family, for merely differing in opinion from those hecates. With hearty wishes for thy success, I remain thine assured friend,

EPHRAIM SMOOTH.

P. S. I have lately had a conversation with one of those deluded creatures, calling themselves "Odd Fellows," He appeared as rational as it was possible for a man to be, and agreed with thee in every thing, till he put one question to me.—*whether I thought thou wouldst write an exposure of the society of Odd Fellows.* I told him that I dared say, thou wouldst not grapple with all existing abuses, at one time; but, I had no doubt, if it was any thing by which one man could hold in mental darkness or dupe another, to an extent that merited thy notice, thou wouldst expose and sap its very foundations, as thou hadst done other crying abuses, although they had come before thee clothed in the omnipotent armour of parliament. At this my auditor turned pale, and he said I hope the — (a vile term, meaning thee) would first die in his cell." Now he could part with the old grey bearded dotard of iniquity religion. He thought the clergy an evil. He could bid a pleasing farewell to Masonry, when he saw her strangling in thy grasp. But he could not resign his hobby, with all the spleen of an irritated child, he stuck the cap of fanaticism upon his head and wore it in spite of my remonstrances.

Thy blow at masonry is a masterpiece and when completed will be one of the best Books for lending out that can be put in a library. I know several who intend to avail themselves of the reading of it by that means.

Note.—I assure Ephraim Smooth and his "Odd Fellow," that I shall expose all the secret associations, as far as I can obtain information; and I wish some good fellows grown too wise to remain odd, would do what some ex-masons have done, to assist me in an exposure. These associations, though patronized by all classes, are a scandal to mankind.

No possible general good can arise from them; but much general evil does arise. The Orange Society in Ireland and even in England is as villainous an institution as was ever formed for the support of tyranny and cheat. The pretended secrets of this society are scarcely worth knowing, as the association is an avowed warring with all human improvement. Still, there is a satisfaction in seeing its ceremonies and secret purposes exposed. Perhaps Ephraim's odd acquaintance, growing ashamed of himself by a little reflection, will see the wisdom of renouncing and denouncing his odd fellows. And, to that end, I hope friend Ephraim will shew him this note and assure him, that I am likely to live long enough in spite of his malicious curse, to humble and shame all such characters. R. C.

COPY OF A LETTER SENT TO THE KING, WINDSOR CASTLE.

SIR, Dorchester Gaol, Sept. 2, 1825.
THE common ideas attached to monarchy are those of apparent splendour or brilliancy, not of mind; but of body, in dress, dwelling, diet attendance equipage, &c., a fancied superiority over other men in physical or legislative powers. It is seen also, that such a monarchy begets a gradation of such circumstances, and all who can get into that gradation extol the the system, under a hope that they shall thereby advance in it. The consequence of this gradation is, that all who attach themselves to it become debased as men and citizens and put off that independence of character which every citizen should hold, to put on a dependance upon every thing that is vile and that preys upon those who produce food and other property. Within the pale of the monarchy, there is nothing produced for the benefit of the nation, nor any thing fairly produced for the support of itself; for property is the all in all of a nation; even the people without it are nothing superior to other herds of cattle. But under a monarchy, they who do produce all this property are told that, like cattle, they are entitled to nothing more than the smallest amount of food that will keep them alive to labour, and that all other profit, beyond the value of that

coarse food, is the profit, of their masters: so that a country monarchically governed may be looked upon as a large farm, the owner of which is the king, and the mass or majority of the people, all whose labour can be used, are to him but one species of labouring brutes, the worst fed and hardest worked of all the species of brutes on the soil. To be sure, they are provided with priests to comfort them, to tell them that they are immortal and are to be very happy in another life if they are quiet and submissive in this; but this is only an aggravation of the original evil.

If human affairs were conducted as they should be, if mankind were not so ignorant so easily cheated, they would not labour for a monarchy, *but for themselves*, and become joint free holders of the soil on which they live. They would not allow a class of men to take of the public produce what pleased and to leave what pleased; but they would keep no more public officers than were necessary and pay them no more than was necessary.

Mr. Thompson has laid it down correctly in his work on the Distribution of Wealth, that, whatever is taken from the property producing man against his consent, is, in fact, a robbery. This will be seen as labouring men grow wiser and more powerful. But for this labouring class of people, a king could find no ornaments for splendour, no luxuries for revelling, no power for despotism. All that is good to all spring from the labour of mankind. Even if property be obtained by war or plunder, that property must have sprung from the labour of some part of mankind.

The maxim, with mankind, should, therefore, be, that all should labour, either mentally or bodily, for the greater benefit of each and all that an idle man pensioned on the labour of others, should not exist.

But the point of this letter is, that mental splendour and brilliancy is the only splendour and brilliancy that is worthy of human encouragement, and that *that* which is merely a matter of show, such as monarchy, a rich priesthood and

aristocracy, masonry and mountebankery, should not be encouraged, but should be cried down as mischievous, debasing and impoverishing to the community as a whole. A single pauper, who is not a cripple, is a disgrace to a country; but pauperism comes from monarchy, priesthood, and the ignorance and wickedness that support such follies.

I am, Sir, your prisoner,

RICHARD CARLILE.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

WE have reprinted Nos. 1 and 3 of Vol. I. Republican, to complete all imperfect sets and to supply further demand. The sheets of the first days proceeding of Mr. Carlile's Mock Trial, that were stolen by the Sheriff and never returned nor accounted for, have been reprinted, to keep on sale that very cheap edition of Paine's Age of Reason, under the form of a trial. Price half a crown. It was read in Court chiefly for that purpose. Several other prints and reprints are in the press, and we hope by Christmas, to have the whole catalogue of promises and O. P.'s completed. Then comes the Joint Stock Company, to sweep the filth of prejudice with its thousand brooms: to collect in the English Language and in the neatest form, every good work that has been written that is here known or unknown, and that can be procured.

Printed and Published by R. CARLILE, 135, Fleet Street.—All Correspondences for "The Republican" to be left at the place of publication.